



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Introduction

Citation for published version:

Los, B & de Haan, P 2017, Introduction. in B Los & P de Haan (eds), *Word Order Change in Acquisition and Language Contact: Essays in Honour of Ans van Kemenade*. Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, John Benjamins Pub Co, pp. 1-5. <https://doi.org/20.500.11820/ceb878a3-0b7a-45da-9233-87ce9a9090c3>, <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.243.01los>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[20.500.11820/ceb878a3-0b7a-45da-9233-87ce9a9090c3](https://doi.org/20.500.11820/ceb878a3-0b7a-45da-9233-87ce9a9090c3)
[10.1075/la.243.01los](https://doi.org/10.1075/la.243.01los)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Early version, also known as pre-print

Published In:

Word Order Change in Acquisition and Language Contact

Publisher Rights Statement:

This chapter has been accepted for publication in "Word Order Change in Acquisition and Language Contact: Essays in honour of Ans van Kemenade", © John Benjamins 2017. The publisher should be contacted for permission to re-use the material in any form.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Introduction

Running head: Introduction

Introduction

Bettelou Los¹ and Pieter de Haan²

University of Edinburgh¹/Radboud University Nijmegen²

The chapters in this volume are in honour of Ans van Kemenade, who celebrated her 60th birthday on 4 September 2014, which was marked by a surprise symposium, held in her honour on 3 September 2014 in Huize Heyendaal (*het Kasteeltje*) in Nijmegen. This volume contains some of these papers, as well as those solicited at a later stage.

Ans' first contribution to the field of English historical syntax was her dissertation, entitled *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*, published by Foris in 1987 and now a classic. Using Koster's (1975) diagnostic tests, Ans demonstrated that OE had a rule of verb-fronting similar to the Verb-Second (V2) rule of Modern Dutch and German, but with an important twist that obscured its resemblance to the other West-Germanic languages. If the first constituent is not a *wh*-word, the negator *ne* or a member of a restricted group of adverbs (most prominently *þa* 'then'), full nominal subjects are still in the third position, as expected

under Verb-Second, but pronoun subjects are not: instead, they precede the finite verb, which now looks to be in third place (in bold):

(1) *Æfter þysum wordum he **gewende** to þam ærendracan*

After these words he turned to the messenger

“After these words he turned to the messenger” (ÆLS (Edmund) 83)

Ans argues in the dissertation that pronouns are clitics in Old English and attach to V, which would explain why they show up to the left of the finite verb in (1); (1) would then also be an example of verb-second, with the verb still moving to the same position (identified as C, the head of CP, the highest projection of the clause) even though it appears to be in third place in surface structure. The literature has since appeared to reach a consensus that verb movement in Old English involves two landing sites, C (or Force in Rizzi’s cartographic approach, see Biberauer & Roberts, this volume) for the movement involved in questions and negation (Focus movement) and a lower landing site for the movement involved in (1), variously argued to be I, the head of IP (Pintzuk 1999), AgrS (Haeberli 2000, Warner 2007), non-committally, F (for ‘Functional Projection’, van Kemenade 2000), or Fin (Biberauer & Roberts, this volume). The purpose behind such movements of the finite verb can be argued to have been, at least originally, to create a Focus domain, or, in the case of movement as in (1), to demarcate a domain for given information (as argued in Los 2012).

As all the authors in this volume are either colleagues, collaborators, or PhDs of Ans, there are close links to Ans' areas of research: V2, Old English Syntax, information structure, word order change, and particles, and these areas have determined the five parts of this volume.

The papers in the first part, *Grammar change and information structure*, address word order change at the microvariation level, where successive generations of speakers converge on a different, often more restricted conditioning environment for orders that at one time were canonical, and the role of information structure in that process.

Roland Hinterhölzl offers an integrated account of word order, information structure (focus) and prosody, arguing that the combined impact of the grammaticalization of the definite determiner and the loss of case morphology in eME led to the loss of OV orders. 'Weight' – in terms of 'heavy NPs' – is a crucial concept in OV/VO studies, as well as the information-structural status of such constituents, but prosody tends to be left out of the equation (but see Speyer 2010 for a prosodic account of the decline of V2).

Marit Westergaard discusses contact and microvariation in V2 phenomena in North Norwegian dialects. Although some dialects show optionality as the result of contact, speakers do not seem to have converged on information-structural niches for each variant, although this is what typically happens with optionality in syntax. What may have happened is that any such emerging patterns broke down when the variation increased

due to increased dialect contact, a conclusion which may also explain developments in V2 syntax in early Middle English.

Teresa Biberauer and Ian Roberts document a case of change from a mesoparameter to a microparameter to a nanoparameter involving inversion in counterfactual conditionals in the history of English. Conditional inversion became increasingly restricted to *had*, *should* and *were*. This development is argued to be the result of increasingly complex formal feature bundles becoming sensitive to increasingly specific instances of T-to-C movement.

In a single-authored chapter, Teresa Biberauer looks at the embedded V2 pattern that is robustly present in modern Afrikaans *wh*-complements, alongside V-final *wh*-complements. She connects the phenomenon to Afrikaans's peculiar bipartite negation system, and argues that the introduction of phrase-final *nie₂* in negative structures led to the grammaticalization of a CP-peripheral Pol(arity)-head. If the general restriction on V-to-C movement in embedded contexts in Germanic is defined, following suggestions in the literature, as a ban on movement to the head of a lexically selected CP, V2 in embedded interrogatives in Afrikaans can be accounted for, as we can assume that the matrix predicate selects PolP, rather than CP; and with CP not lexically selected, V can move to C.

The papers in the second part all deal with subjects and topics. Gea Dreschler paper refines the prediction presented by Biberauer & van Kemenade (2011) that subjects of passives and unaccusatives in OE can only remain in their original 'late' position in the clause when they are not

information-structurally old (i.e., new). Dreschler compares the ‘late’ subjects of passives to passive subjects in the higher positions with respect to weight, definiteness, and the type of clause-initial element of the passive clause and is able to refine Biberauer & van Kemenade’s findings by making a further distinction in hearer-old/discourse-old, hearer-new/discourse-new: the majority of the late subjects are discourse-new.

Erwin Komen’s chapter follows seamlessly on from the previous one in that it surveys the various subject positions in Old English, including the crucial positions made available by V2, with respect to properties typically associated with subjects. He finds that a decline in the frequency of these properties precedes a decline in the frequency of subjects appearing in these positions.

Ann Taylor and Susan Pintzuk look at conjoined subjects which in Old English may be separated by other material, in ways that are no longer possible (**He should and his offspring keep this promise* versus *He and his offspring should keep his promise*). On the basis of an examination of all the split subjects in the YCOE alongside their non-split counterparts, the chapter proposes an analysis for both leftward movement of the first conjunct and rightward movement of the second.

The next part considers likely repercussions of the emergence and decline of V2 in other areas of the grammar. Monique Tangelder and Bettelou Los argue that the metre of the OE poem Beowulf does not readily accommodate verbs in second position; the vast majority of such verbs appear in unstressed, extrametrical positions such as the beginning of a light

a-verse, or in anacrusis of the b-verbs, but this entails that the verb, as well as the preceding element, is monosyllabic. This suggests that the metre, an inheritance from Common Germanic, predates the rise of V2.

Gert-Jan Postma identifies the rise-and-fall pattern of Old English *weorðan* as a passive auxiliary as a ‘failed change’, which he connects to another failed change: the rise-and-fall of strict V2 in Old English. The connection between V2 and *weorðan* is supported by cross-linguistic data from Romance and Germanic, and modelled by a syntactic projection of Reichenbachian S,E,R-events.

Marianne Starren analyses the complementary distribution between V2 and the progressive in terms of ‘macrostructural’ planning (“deciding what to say, and how to say it”). A comparison of retellings of the action of a silent animation, *The Quest*, shows that there are marked differences between German and English with respect to the sequencing of events, and the selection of subjects, with Dutch occupying a position somewhere in the middle.

The fourth part includes three papers on particles. Robbert van Sluijs, Pieter Muysken and Bettelou Los use particle position as a diagnostic for underlying word order of Dutch lexifier Creoles (Berbice Dutch Creole, Virgin Island Creole Dutch (Negerhollands), and Afrikaans). As creole languages are generally claimed to be SVO, but these languages result from contact situations with Dutch, an SOV language, such an investigation may yield interesting results.

The Romance languages are characterized by a number of prepositions and particles (adverbs) whose etymological source involves a combination of two or more Latin items: e.g. Italian *da* ‘by’ < Latin *de ab* ‘of from’; French *devant* ‘in front of’ < Latin *de ab ante* ‘of from before’. Nigel Vincent investigates the history of one particle, Latin *DĒ*, and its later history in the Romance languages. The conclusion is that particles and prepositions differ in their morphological status (the latter project, the former do not) but their synchronic behaviour as well as their historical development show that they belong to the same larger class.

Marion Elenbaas queries the usefulness of particles as reliable diagnostic elements for OV/VO word order in diachronic studies, and argues that a precise characterisation of the functional and categorial status of particles in earlier stages of English is needed first. Her study explores the information-structural status of the various constituents in OE clauses with particles. As particles grammaticalized into non-projecting items, there were word order effects which in turn may have affected the flow of information.

The fifth part contains two papers that investigate L1 interference in Second Language Acquisition, focusing on the acquisition of written English. Pieter de Haan presents a corpus study of middle field orders in Dutch that suggest that the Dutch interest in the use of English as a *lingua franca*, particularly in education, has led to many Dutch L1 speakers acquiring English to such a high standard that it is more a second language than a foreign language. This widespread English-Dutch bilingualism has

led to the use of English word orders in Dutch texts, suggesting that the Dutch middle field may be gradually losing its flexibility.

Sanne van Vuuren and Rina de Vries present a case study on the role of L1 transfer at the highest proficiency levels of the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment* (Council of Europe 2001; henceforth *CEFR*), i.e. C1 and C2. While at earlier stages of acquisition cross-linguistic differences between a V2/SOV language like Dutch and an SVO language like English might result in word order problems, previous research has shown that at advanced levels students' writing is relatively free from obvious grammatical errors. However, even at these very advanced levels, students' writing can often still be recognized as showing L1 interference in its information structure. Obvious recommendations are that advanced students should be made aware of the information-structural differences between Dutch and English by explicit instruction, and that these information-structural contrasts might be included in the descriptors of C1 and C2.

We hope that this volume is a fitting celebration of Ans' strong and sustained contribution to the field, and of her leadership in fostering and championing young researchers.

References

- Biberauer, Theresa & van Kemenade, Ans. 2011. Subject positions and information-structural diversification in the history of English. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 10: 17-69.
- Haeberli, Eric. 2002. Observations on the Loss of Verb Second in the History of English. In *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax: Proceedings from the 15th Workshop on Comparative Germanic Syntax*, C. Jan Wouter Zwart & Werner Abraham (eds), 245-72. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- van Kemenade, Ans. 1987. *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- van Kemenade, Ans. 2000. Jespersen's Cycle Revisited: Formal Properties of Grammaticalization. In *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*, Susan Pintzuk, George Tsoulas & Anthony Warner (eds), 51-74. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koster, Jan. 1975. Dutch as an SOV Language. *Linguistic Analysis* 1: 111-36.
- Los, Bettelou. 2012. The loss of verb-second and the switch from bounded to unbounded systems. In *Information Structure and Syntactic Change in the History of English*, Anneli Meurman-Solin, Maria José López-Couso & Bettelou Los, 21-46. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pintzuk, Susan. 1999. *Phrase Structures in Competition: Variation and Change in Old English Word Order*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Speyer, Augustin. 2010. *Topicalization and Stress Clash Avoidance in the History of English*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Warner, Anthony. 2007. Parameters of Variation between Verb-Subject and Subject-Verb order in Late Middle English. *English Language and Linguistics* 11: 81-111.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 1993. *Dutch Syntax: A Minimalist Approach*. Groningen: Universiteitsdrukkerij.